



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

. . . Senator d'Estournelles de Constant, in a speech in the French Senate on December 27 on the navy budget, made another important contribution to the discussion of the question of limitation of armaments as it remains since the close of the second Hague Conference. This is the third speech of Mr. d'Estournelles on this grave problem within the last three years. We have just received the French text of the speech and hope to give it to our readers in English in our next issue.

. . . Dr. Francis H. Rowley, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Boston, in a noteworthy sermon preached Sunday morning, January 26, declared that, as in the case of an individual, "if a nation has any religion it will show it, particularly in its attitude toward and its treatment of other nations." In the Gospel of Christ "nothing is more fundamental, of its very essence, than the principles of justice and love." The Church, with which "war has nothing in common," ought to "lift up its voice in one mighty protest against the ancient and barbarous resort to force as a means by which Christian nations would settle their difficulties." "The spirit of militarism," of which there is an extraordinary recrudescence at the present time, "is the very antithesis of the spirit of Christ. He who appeals to Christ to justify so gigantic and dehumanizing an evil as war, simply does not know the mind of Christ." Let every minister in the land raise his voice in this clear way, and send his protest to Congress forthwith, and the curious naval craze will cease.

. . . President Roosevelt announced on January 14 that we shall on or before February 1, 1909, evacuate Cuba and "Turn over the island to the President and Congress to be elected next December by the people of Cuba." The announcement was received in Havana "everywhere with expressions of the keenest satisfaction, and confidence in the determination of President Roosevelt to carry out his pledge." A similar announcement with regard to the Philippines before the President's term of office expires would, without doubt, be received *everywhere* with the keenest satisfaction throughout the islands, and with equally keen satisfaction by a large majority of our own people.

. . . Secretary Taft, in an address before the Ohio Society at Philadelphia, on January 14, said: "The idea that we are going to war with Japan is absurd. There is no reason for us to go to war with Japan and there is no reason why she should go to war with us. Japan does not want to go to war with us, and we do not want to go to war with Japan." That is certainly the common sense of the situation. But why should Mr. Taft, in the same speech, declare that the sailing of the big fleet to the Pacific "has already fulfilled its mission in convincing the Orient that this country is ever ready for emergencies"? But why have gone to the trouble and great expense of convincing the Orient of this, if the Orient does not want to go to war with us?

. . . The *Pall Mall Gazette*, in an article on Foreign Navies by "A Naval Expert," declares that Admiral Evans could "by no manner of means" have moved the big fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific without the assistance of a foreign power—England. English colliers were necessary to supply "this modern Armada

with coal." This means of supply would be cut off in case of war. How our big navy "patriots" will chafe under the suggestion that we cannot even supply the motive power for a cruise of our big fighting ships without the aid of foreigners! Their remedy will of course be "more big ships!"

. . . We mentioned in a previous issue the praiseworthy purpose of our government to remit to China such part of the damages assessed at the time of the Boxer troubles as was in excess of the amount necessary to cover the injury done to our government and citizens. Secretary Hay at the time explained to the Chinese government that only such part of the American portion of the indemnity as was needed to pay all just claims would be retained. In accordance with the President's recommendation, the Senate has unanimously adopted a joint resolution for the remission to China of half the amount of indemnity assessed at the time. The House will certainly approve and twelve millions of the indemnity will not be collected. This act of simple justice would hardly be worthy of emphasis were such a deed not so rare between nations.

. . . It is reported that Sir Robert Bond, Premier of Newfoundland, will shortly visit Ottawa, Canada, to discuss with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other officials the arrangement for the participation of Newfoundland with Canada in the reference to the Hague Court of the fisheries controversy with the United States. It is rumored that the question of the federation of Newfoundland with the Canadian Provinces will also be considered at the same time.

. . . Hon. Isaac R. Sherwood, Representative in Congress from the Ninth Ohio District, has introduced a bill to reduce the regular army to thirty-five thousand men. Mr. Sherwood, who "has seen enough of war to make him an advocate of peace," proposes to speak on the subject while the Army Bill is under consideration in the House. He hopes, with the support he may get from the country, to be able "to convince the war-mad masses that Christian civilization stands for peace."

The Successes and Failures of the Second Hague Conference.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, LL.D.

The second Hague Conference, called originally by President Roosevelt, but actually assembled by the Czar of Russia, met on the 15th of June, 1907, and continued in session till the 18th of October. All of the independent nations of the world except Costa Rica, Honduras, Abyssinia and Liberia were represented in it, the former two of these having been invited to send delegates. There were, including attachés and secretaries, two hundred and forty-four members of the Conference. Of these, twelve were ambassadors, thirty ministers plenipotentiary, fifteen members of the present Hague Court and about a dozen had been members of the first Hague Conference. The Conference will always be notable as the first general representative assembly of the world.

Both during the latter part of the Conference and since its close there has been much unfavorable criticism

of it. It has even been pronounced a failure and a farce. This pessimistic feeling, however, does not seem to me to be well founded, as a careful analysis of the results of the Conference will clearly show.

The only sense in which the second Hague Conference can be considered a failure is, that it did not accomplish all that the most advanced advocates of international peace thought that it ought to accomplish. No attention need be paid to the utterances of the small class of critics who, because of their attachment to the present military and naval order of things, really wished the Conference to fail. If the Conference had reached agreements for the immediate limitation and early reduction of armaments, for the conclusion of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration providing for the reference of all international controversies to arbitration, if it had formally established a permanent International Court of Justice with judges always in service and holding regular sessions of the Court, if it had made all unoffending private property at sea exempt from capture in war time, and had provided that war should never be resorted to until the question in dispute had been examined by an impartial International Commission of Inquiry,—if it had done all these things, in addition to what it actually accomplished, the most sanguine peace idealist would not have charged it with failure. The large feeling of disappointment that the Conference did no more than it did, is a most hopeful omen. It means that the public sentiment of the world, at least the most intelligent part of it, is already considerably farther advanced in the demand for general and permanent peace than the governments are yet ready to go. It would be unfortunate for the cause if this were not so. This advanced state of public opinion assures us that the movement is hereafter to have a regular and certain growth until the great ideals for which the peace movement stands are ultimately essentially realized.

One's estimate of the accomplishments of the Conference will depend very largely on one's point of view. If it be viewed as a single gathering with a definite program, without relation to the past or to the future, it may well be regarded, in considerable measure, a failure. Unfortunately, this is the point of view from which many have regarded it. If, on the contrary, it be looked at as the outcome of the long processes of civilization, especially of the peace and arbitration propaganda of the last hundred years, and as a beginning of a series of world assemblies to meet periodically hereafter for deliberation upon the great coming problems of the nations, then it seems to me that the Conference must be regarded as a conspicuous and memorable success; and this is the only sane point of view from which to regard it.

In the way of positive accomplishments the Conference has made a much greater record than is generally supposed. I am sure that all well-informed persons would so regard it, if the conventions actually reached were fully known and understood. Unfortunately, they have come to the public knowledge only in a scrappy and imperfect way. Some of the most important of them were scarcely alluded to in the press reports. This imperfect knowledge was probably inevitable, as the text of the conventions could not be published in full until they had been reported by the Conference to the governments at home. However, our knowledge is now com-

plete enough to enable us to make up a fair judgment as to the results of the deliberations.

Of the fourteen conventions adopted, the most important is that for the Pacific Settlement of International Controversies, in ninety-seven articles. The basis of this is the convention adopted by the first Hague Conference, under the provisions of which the permanent Court of Arbitration was set up. The recent Conference revised and considerably strengthened the old convention, and issued it as an entirely new document. We have in this document the great work of the first Hague Conference reaffirmed, with a number of important improvements. The chief of these improvements are those which relate to the procedure of the Hague Court, to the use of International Commissions of Inquiry in the case of controversies where the dispute chiefly concerns facts, and the provision, in Article 48, that in case of a conflict between two powers either of them, if the other hesitates or is disinclined to refer the matter to the Hague Court, may go directly to the Bureau of the Court and declare that it desires to have the difference arbitrated. In the convention adopted in 1899 the two powers had to agree before the Court could be approached. This new provision makes it possible for one of the powers to make an offer of arbitration through the Court before the public opinion of the world. The American Delegation, who introduced this provision, believed that it would be morally impossible for any nation to refuse to arbitrate a dispute when the offer was thus openly made before the world. The moral power of the Hague Court, as it now exists, is therefore very greatly increased through this new clause.

The next most important accomplishment is the convention prepared by General Horace Porter, after the extended discussions of the Drago Doctrine, prohibiting the employment of force in the recovery of contractual debts until arbitration to determine the justice of the claim has been resorted to or refused by the debtor country. This convention practically extends the principle of obligatory arbitration to the entire class of questions of monetary claims. If ratified and put into force, there is little doubt that this agreement will put an end hereafter to the disgraceful conduct of a number of nations in attempting to force, by arms, the settlement of debts due by governments to certain of their citizens, without previous inquiry into the justice of the claims.

The third most important convention is that prohibiting the bombardment by naval forces of unfortified cities and ports in time of war; the fourth, that for the establishment of an International Prize Court. This latter has been considered by many, including some of the foremost delegates at The Hague, as the greatest result of the Conference. This convention sets up in time of war an international tribunal for the consideration of all captures made during hostilities, to take the place of the *ex parte* national Prize Courts which have heretofore been employed. Though this agreement is a regulation of war, it greatly extends the principle of international coöperation, and the general effect of it will doubtless be to diminish the chances of war, as well as to limit its lawlessness when once under way. The convention which declares that hereafter all fishing fleets over the whole surface of the oceans shall be inviolable is also a most important one, as it removes one of the great

industries of the world from the perils of violence. Not much less important is the convention declaring the territory of neutrals inviolable. This is only an embodiment in the form of international law of what has in most cases in recent years been the practice of the leading powers.

The convention which extends the principles of the Geneva Red Cross Convention of 1864 to maritime warfare crystallizes into public international law what has already come to be substantially the practice of the leading maritime powers. This convention widens the application of the spirit of mercy and kindness, the spirit which is behind every phase of the peace movement, and will ultimately make war itself impossible. The conventions in regard to the placing of submarine mines, the prohibition of the throwing of projectiles and explosives from balloons, the restriction of the right of capture in maritime war, the one requiring a declaration of war before the opening of hostilities, and the others dealing with the laws and customs of war on land, the rights and duties of neutral powers in both land and maritime war, the transformation of merchantmen into warships, are all in the direction of the limitation and restriction of war. In these conventions the whole body of the nations of the world have for the first time in history jointly laid the hand of restriction heavily upon war. If these conventions shall be ratified by the powers and even reasonably well carried out, war will hereafter be much more difficult than in the past, and to this extent will be much less likely to occur.

The greatest work of the Conference was that done outside of what has been incorporated into these formal conventions. On the subject of limitation of armaments, on which such deep and widespread interest was felt in all countries, no practical agreement was reached. But the subject was much discussed in private at The Hague, and the urgency of the problem has been made much clearer through the resolution unanimously adopted declaring that the study of the question by the governments with a view to some early practical solution is "highly desirable"—these were the words of the resolution—in the interests of the people of the world. The same is true of the principle, so long advocated by our government, of the inviolability of all unoffending private property at sea in time of war. The greatest speech delivered in the Conference was made on this subject by Mr. Choate, and the principle received the hearty support of at least thirty-seven or thirty-eight of the powers. The measure was defeated by the opposition of the British government. But for this opposition, which is difficult to account for in a government professing to be highly civilized, the principle would now be a recognized part of public international law, as it certainly will be in a few years.

In the matter of a permanent International Court of Justice presented and urged so strongly by the American Delegation, the Conference reached practical, if not altogether formal agreement. The principle of such a court was adopted unanimously; this is most remarkable, as it was the first time that the proposition had been taken up and seriously discussed in a general international conference. The only failure was in reaching an agreement as to the method of selecting the judges. It is understood that this problem will be taken up by the governments

themselves. Prof. James Brown Scott, Solicitor of our State Department, who was the American technical international law expert at the Conference and drafted the plan for this Court, has publicly declared that the Conference has actually settled this matter, and that we shall have this great Supreme Court of the World as the result of the Conference.

On one other subject also the Conference rendered possibly the greatest of all its services. It declared unanimously in favor of periodic Hague conferences hereafter, and set the date for the meeting of the next conference, about seven years hence. It also provided that a special commission appointed by the governments shall be created some two years in advance to study and prepare the program of the third Hague Conference. The recent Conference has therefore not only laid the foundations for a periodic Congress or Parliament of the Nations, which has been advocated by all the great international men of the past century, indeed of the past three centuries, but by its provision for the third Conference has actually inaugurated the greatest possible institution which can be conceived in the interests of the order and peace of the world.

It would not be far from the truth if one should say that the greatest and most far-reaching result of the Conference was the Conference itself. That all, or practically all, of the nations of the world should meet in a general assembly and continue in session four months discussing with perfect frankness, and yet with absolute fairness and friendliness, the great problems in which they are all so deeply interested, is a fact of marvelous significance. If the Conference had done nothing else, it would have been worth a thousand times all that it cost. The difficulties of such a meeting were much greater than many suppose. It would not have been surprising if the historic dislikes and prejudices, the differences of race, language and judicial methods, the force of local interests and ambitions had made the gathering short-lived and valueless. But these were all overcome. The Conference lasted much longer than was expected, and the spirit of conciliation and concord grew in depth and strength to the very last. The experiment of a world assembly has been tried and proved a remarkable success. Other conferences will follow, and the world will no longer move in sections and halves, as heretofore, but as one united world; and the final, and we may hope not very remote, outcome will be the universal and perpetual peace which the great leaders of civilization and progress have so long seen coming.

The Churches and the Peace Movement.

BY REV. JAMES L. TRYON.

Chairman of the Church Committee of the American Peace Society.

Now that the governments have taken up the peace movement, the people everywhere must be taught its principles in order that it may have the support of an enlightened public opinion. The people must learn to be reasonable and self-restrained in times of national trial; more so now by far than in days when brute force rather than law was the reliance of a nation in securing justice. This applies also to local officials